

12 December 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: Mr. Tweedy, D/DCI/IC

SUBJECT: Improving the NSCIC Study Program

1. The following are suggestions for possible use in your discussion with Andy Marshall on 13 December. The suggestions relate to two ways in which the NSCIC study program to assess the responsiveness of intelligence products might be improved.
2. It is clear that the present system of using ad hoc, part-time task groups to conduct case studies of intelligence performance during crisis situations or to assess the quality of intelligence coverage of selected subject topics is not proceeding in a manner which Andy considers satisfactory. I think there are two reasons for this.
3. First, the study projects represent an "add on" to the responsibilities of men who already have full time duties in their particular specialties and, second, the men selected for the task groups are members of intelligence organizations, the products and responsiveness of which are being evaluated. It is a bit unrealistic to expect that such men will feel free to criticize the effectiveness with which their own organizations have been functioning. The effect which severe criticism might have on future career prospects of the critics is certainly one of the inhibiting factors.
4. My first suggestion, then, is that responsibility for the conduct of these studies be assigned to a special group, members of which would devote full time to the conduct of studies, with Andy and myself serving as advisors and monitors.
5. Such a group could consist of as few as three members, one each from CIA, DIA, and INR/State, assigned as ad hoc members of the DCI/IC/PRG staff. Each person would be responsible for the conduct of individual studies and, as a group, they could serve as a "murder board" on papers produced by their individual efforts. Members would be appointed to the group for a one year tour which could be extended if necessary to enable the completion of particular studies which were well along at the termination of the one year period. Selectees for this group should be professionals

with extensive experience in intelligence production so that they will be knowledgeable of the problems involved, but they also should be persons who are at that stage of their career in which they need have no concern about future promotion prospects if their criticism antagonizes production office chiefs. Men within a year or two of retirement or who already are retired might be appropriate candidates.

6. Andy might object to this on the grounds that he would prefer young aggressive personalities, but if men of this type were selected I believe they should logically come from outside the intelligence community. To date Andy has had little success in recruiting this type of personnel to serve on the study groups as representatives of user organizations, and I really doubt that the Departments of State or Defense or the NSC Staff itself would be willing to provide full time assignees for the study program.

7. It may well be that if a program such as I suggest were adopted, Andy would prefer to conduct it with consultants from academia or the "think tanks" as full-time project officers. From a practical standpoint, I believe a compromise would be the more practical solution -- have the three study group personnel selected from within the intelligence community but include in the IC budget provision for the employment of consultants from outside the government to (1) make an independent assessment of the quality of particular products where this is appropriate, and (2) critique the draft studies prepared by members of the study group. Consultant fees (at \$150 per day) should amount to no more than \$4,000 per study and (assuming that each of the three task group members completed two studies per year) about \$25,000 per year.

8. I consider that a group of three competent personnel should be adequate to the task, providing two conditions are met:

a. First, since objections are likely to be raised by the production office chiefs on the grounds that they cannot spare personnel of the quality that would be needed, it will be necessary that the DCI clearly indicate to the DDI, the Director, DIA, and the Director, INR, that he considers this an important program which must be staffed by top-quality personnel, and.

b. Second, the DCI advise the directors of production organizations that his interest in the success of the review program is such that he wants the production chiefs to make certain that their offices provide full coordination to members of the study group and insure that they have ready access to whatever materials are needed for their studies.

9. As a second proposal, I suggest you discuss with Andy the direct involvement of the NSCIC Working Group in an assessment of the published NIEs and SNIEs. This is a project I submitted to you last June, but at that time it involved a proposal that NSCIC principals comment on the NIE quarterly schedules, that non-USIB representatives as appropriate be involved in developing NIE terms of reference, and that the NSCIC Working Group members evaluate each NIE and SNIE published.

10. John Huizenqa strongly opposed such a project, but Ed Proctor favored it. Because of the DNE objections, no further action has been taken.

11. I now propose that the project be revived but be delimited to the review of published NIEs and SNIEs. NSCIC Working Group members representing NSCIC principals (but not the chiefs of production offices) would be responsible for having an evaluation form filled out by senior level intelligence users in their department or agency within 30 days after USIB approval of each estimate. The initial project would be limited to a six-month period. The completed evaluation forms would be submitted to the PRG/IC for assembly into a three-month and a six-month report to the Working Group. Assistance of Andy Marshall, ONE, and the Psychological Support Staff of ONS/DDS would be sought in refinement of the evaluation form.

12. The evaluation form would be designed primarily to elicit comments from intelligence users as to the responsiveness of the estimate to their perceived needs, but the form also would provide for comment on the quality of the analysis contained in the estimate, the manner in which alternative viewpoints are presented and the degree to which disagreements in interpretation are fairly presented.

13. A combination of the two foregoing proposals should help to alleviate some of the concerns which Andy has been expressing concerning progress of the NSCIC study program.

[Redacted]
Chief, PRG/IC

25X1

[Redacted]
Distribution:

orig - addressee

(1) - PRG subject

1 - [Redacted] chrono

1 - PRG subject *chronology*